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Bishops in the Catholic Peace Tradition

Ronald G. Musto
University of Bristol
rg.musto@bristol.ac.uk

This brief survey takes a historical perspective on the role of Catholic bishops in global peacemaking. Building on my previous work\(^1\) and more recent research, it focuses on the roles of bishop as teacher, ruler, and minister of the sacraments and on the interplay between prophetic protest and institutional authority. It covers the origins of the bishop’s office, the development of prophetic protest and rule in episcopal peacemaking in the early church and Middle Ages, including the Peace and Truce of God. It then turns to early modern peacemaking and the influence of humanist thinkers on Latin American missionary bishops, including Bartolomé de Las Casas. For the modern world it discusses the Catholic bishops’ response to communism, Nazism, and World War II, the bishops’ role in post-war Europe, Africa, Latin America, Asia, and the USA, and concludes with recent US bishops’ thought and action on peace.
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**Origins of the Bishop**

According to the Roman Catholic Code of Canon Law (II.1.Canon 375 §1–2),\(^2\) the nature of the episcopate is apostolic and hierarchical, and its role is threefold: to teach, to administer the sacraments, and to govern. While historical examples of episcopal peacemaking concentrate largely on either the teaching (prophetic) or governing (law codes, exercise of state power, etc.), the sacramental nature of this peacemaking is also important. Bishops incorporate the call for peace in the very nature of the Mass, in the kiss of peace and in blessings; but also in liturgical actions like processions and assemblies, in sacramental symbols, and in ceremonies of forgiveness and reconciliation.

Although the origins of the Christian episcopate remain unclear, by the 2nd century CE, the office was emerging within the apostolic church.\(^3\) With the adoption of Christianity as the Roman state religion beginning in the 4th century, this developing institutional framework borrowed two key structures of imperial military and civil organization: the diocese (Latin *dioecesis*, “a governor’s jurisdiction”; Greek *dioikēsis* “administration”), a territorial unit centered on an officially recognized, central administration in the second structural element: the Roman city, the *civitas* (the social body of the citizens united by law). By the early Middle Ages to be a *civitas* meant that a city had a bishop; and any town with a bishop was by definition a *civitas*. Within this developing structure, Christian leadership embodied in the office and person of the bishop (*episcopus*, Greek for inspectors sent to subject states), retained the two major functions of teacher and administrator, often expressed in terms of prophet and ruler, and manifested these through the bishop’s organization of sacramental and liturgical life.

**The Early Church: Bishops as Prophets**

Throughout Catholic history these three roles have taken different emphases for peacemaking.
Among early Christian apologists, who explained the Christian faith to the pagan elite, were prominent theorists of peace, including Bishop Ignatius of Antioch (d.c.107 CE). Here we offer a few examples of the prophetic teaching role of later early Christian bishops.⁴ Cyprian was bishop of Carthage (c.249–258 CE). In his On the Value of Patience, To Donatus, On the Dress of Virgins, and Letters, Cyprian reminded his congregation that killing is a mortal sin. He noted that although society views the murder of one person as a heinous crime, it considers the murder of thousands on a general’s order a great virtue. Rather than inflict injury, Cyprian urged Christians to suffer martyrdom in witness to peace. Forced to flee during Decius’ persecution in 249 CE, he returned to Carthage in 251 and was arrested under Valerian’s persecution in 258, convicted of treason, and executed. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, was martyred around 165. His biography concluded:

Having vanquished by his patience [nonviolence] the unjust ruler, and thus received the crown of immortality, he rejoices greatly with the apostles and with all the just (Musto, 2002, pp. 40–41).

Bishops as Rulers
By the late empire, the law code of Theodosius II (416 CE) specified that only Christians could serve in the army.⁵ Christians had come to be synonymous with Roman citizens just as the Church had come to represent Romanitas. The empire put on the robes of Christianity and the protection of the Christian God as a means of preserving its rule, and the Church began to borrow the trappings of empire. Christian bishops became increasingly involved in the civil lives of their congregations and in the administration of the empire.

Two examples must suffice. As bishop, Ambrose of Milan became a loyal defender of the Christian empire; he saw its wars as a legitimate means to peace. Ambrose recognized peace as the higher goal of war and placed the “peace-loving inclination” beyond criticism.⁶ Yet his condemnation and excommunication of the Emperor Theodosius I for massacring 6,000 rebels at Thessaloniki in 390, Ambrose’s imposition of a severe public penance, and the emperor’s humiliation in fulfilling it are landmarks in the history of Christian checks on the violence of the state. Ambrose showed the same abhorrence for violence in his dealings with heretics.

His Sermon against Auxentius of 386 declares that nonviolence is his weapon. Fearing neither weapons nor the barbarian foe, Ambrose tells his congregation that “when one is the servant of God, it is not a human army, but the providence of the Lord that will protect you” (Musto, 2002, p. 48). Both Old and New Testaments abound in examples of nonviolent resistance and martyrdom, he explains. Ambrose recounts that his congregation risked death to protect him from imperial troops in a mass, nonviolent protest outside Milan’s cathedral. In his Commentary on Psalm 118, Ambrose notes that peace is the virtue of the humble, who refuse involvement in dissension, cruelty, debauchery, and wealth and who follow justice. Christian peace is not a possession passively hoarded but a process vigorously pursued. It is granted not to the passive, but to those who actively dominate life’s problems.

These ideas find their full expression with Ambrose’s protege, Bishop Augustine of Hippo (354–430).⁷ Augustine is responsible for helping to define two traditions of immense bearing on Catholic peacemaking. The first is peace as the “tranquility of order”; the second, the theory of
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The just war. Augustine shared a widespread admiration for Rome as the agent of peace and maintained that its wars and emperors were aided by God. In his City of God (413–426 CE) and in other works he developed ideas on the just war, distinguishing between inner disposition and external act.

This Manichean-influenced dichotomy has influenced Western thought on war into our century. Augustine postulates that it is possible to love an enemy internally and still to kill him, just as the Christian bishop can love the heretic and still exercise this love through punishment or coercion. Even the ultimate aim of Roman war was peace. Augustine’s description of tranquillitas fit well into late Roman ideas of the Christian state. It allowed inner peace to be insured by external order based on force, as long as that force was motivated by love, the ordo amoris.

Yet Augustine’s City of God also rejected the synthesis of pagan empire and Christian Church established in the eastern empire. He contrasts true peace — the ascetic, perfect tranquility of God’s servants in the vision of God — with the false, imperfect, and external pax romana attained through ordo. He developed the theory of the two cities — one of God, the other of the world — that would coexist until the end of time. Augustine sees the Roman state as “alienated” from God, built on tyranny and the domination of others. The very extent of the empire has given rise to wars of a worse kind. Even just wars, if considered by the wise, seem lamentable. Augustine defines the peace of the just war as a perverted imitation of God. He notes that kingdoms without justice are nothing but “gangs of criminals on a large scale.” Generals on a small scale are called pirates, and on a large scale, emperors.

True peace is the love of God and of all people. It is an active quality of the virtuous life resulting not from “lust for domination, but from a dutiful concern with the interests of others” (Musto, 2002, p. 49). Augustine discussions of peace are intrinsically bound to his notion of the City of God as the Christian community set in opposition to the material state. Peace must be seen in the context of the mystic Jerusalem, which itself means “vision of peace.” Individual reform is the sole remedy against the ills of history; and individual, not institutional, change alone leads to perfection.

The Early Middle Ages

Peacemaking in the late ancient and early Middle Ages must be set against the collapse of Rome, the gradual transformation of the imperial world into one of local peoples and governments, and the change in belief systems generally described as the end of paganism and the emergence of Christendom. The examples below should be understood within this new world of shifting political, social, religious, and material conditions.8

Hilary, bishop of Poitiers (c.315–367),9 was a convert to Christianity and bishop of Poitiers in southern Gaul. He was exiled to Asia Minor for his opposition to the Arian heresy of the emperors but sent back to Gaul in 360. Hilary defined peace not as the cessation of conflict but as seeking perfection, a form of active peacemaking. “Learning peace,” he declared, “is the characteristic of those who listen to their will.” (Musto, 2002, p. 50)

Martin, bishop of Tours (b.c.316),10 was the son of a military tribe. At age fifteen he was required by law to enter military service. When he tried to avoid the imperial guard, his father
forced him to take the military oath in chains. He is often portrayed as a soldier, especially in the famous scene of his dividing his military cloak to share with a homeless man.

Converted at age twenty-two, he stayed in the service at the request of his military tribune. Yet this was no longer an age of peaceful policing that long characterized Roman military duty. Gaul was being overrun by the Germanic peoples, and Martin was called into active duty. Refusing to accept his bonus pay, even for a just, defensive war, he applied for a discharge, telling the Caesar in command, “I have been your soldier up to now. Let me now be God’s. Let someone who is going to fight have your bonus. I am Christ’s soldier. I am not allowed to fight” (Musto, 2002, p. 52).

Martin’s biographer, Sulpicius Severus, notes that his refusal to fight was not based on cowardice but on his refusal to kill. To prove his courage, he offered to lead the battle line the next day unarmed, protected only by his faith. That night the enemy miraculously withdrew. After his discharge, Martin became a disciple of Hilary of Poitiers. He was soon called out of seclusion to become bishop of Tours. As bishop he began converting the pagan Aedui around Autun. According to Sulpicius, Martin was attacked while destroying a pagan temple. In response, he offered his bare neck to the sword. Confounded by his example, the pagans destroyed their own temple and converted.

Martin combined this missionary peacemaking with a prophetic criticism of the brutality of the new ruling class in Gaul and resisted both violence against heretics and capital punishment. While rhetorical and full of miraculous causality, Sulpicius’s biography reflects the reality of Martin’s life and the ideas of the author and his circle who saw the saint’s life as a protest against militarism.

Among Martin’s circle, bishops Paulinus of Nola and Victricius of Rouen attempted to imitate him by rejecting their military oaths. Victricius (c.330–c.407) converted while a soldier. Nearly killed as punishment, he was discharged and led the life of an itinerant preacher until he was named bishop of Rouen c.385. As an active missionary he established monasteries as exemplary Christian communities. He brought peace to his troubled province (modern Normandy), converting “to a peaceful way of life both the barbarians outside the frontier and the oppressed classes within it” (Musto, 2002, p. 52).

In the Alps around Turin, the bishop of that city, Maximus (fl.450–465), who had witnessed a massacre of missionary bishops by the Germanic peoples, pressed for their nonviolent conversion. He warned, “What should be said of us, who are forced to live piously, not by devotion but by terror?” (Musto, 2002, p. 53).

Germanus of Auxerre was born c.378 in northern Gaul of aristocratic Christian parents. He became a lawyer in Rome, married, and then returned to Gaul where he was appointed a military commander. He was soon elected bishop and thereupon abandoned his old life. Germanus’ episcopate coincided with the Germanic invasion of Gaul and Britain. He made two trips across the Channel. His biographer reports that on his first voyage he converted the British army and brought about their nonviolent, if not miraculous, defeat of the Saxons and Picts. He combined peacemaking with the active pursuit of social justice, protecting the poor from the oppression of
taxes, blaming poverty for crime, and seeking to remedy the exploitation of the people within his diocese.

Returning from one of his trips to Britain, Germanus was greeted by a delegation from western Brittany seeking his protection from the savage King Goar of the Alans. Alone and unarmed, the aging bishop went out to confront Goar. “The march was already in progress when the meeting took place, the priest was opposed to a war-lord clad in armor and surrounded by his bodyguard” (Musto, 2002, p. 55). Shaken by the strength of Germanus’ authority, the king abandoned his campaign.

Germanus’ most famous disciple was Saint Patrick (c. 385–461). The son of a Romano-British civil servant and Christian (woman) deacon, Patrick went to Ireland as a missionary in 432. In his Letter to Coroticus (c.450), Patrick rebukes the nominally Christian king whose followers, the Picts, had massacred some recently baptized Christians. Patrick condemns soldiers as “gangsters,” “ravenous wolves,” and “fellow citizens of demons” (Musto, 2002, p. 55). He then called on Coroticus and his followers to abandon their ways.

Caesarius of Arles was a monk at Lerins before becoming bishop of Arles in 503. He acted as arbiter among the warring tribes, saving Arles from destruction during its recurring captures. He was a staunch promoter of the religious life for women and founded the first convent for women in Gaul, insisting that every nun be taught to read and write. He realized the need for basic laws that could free subjects from the whims of local warlords and so published an adaptation of the Roman Theodosian Code that became the Breviarium Alarici, the civil code for Gaul.

Nicetius of Trier (d.566) was another monk called to be bishop of his frontier city. Like Caesarius, he used his position to protect his city and his people from the depredations of the Frankish nobility. He criticized King Chlotar I for his excesses and was banished as a result. Germanus of Paris was abbot of St. Symphorian near Paris until he became bishop of the city c.556. He was unswerving in his attempts to end civil strife and to curb the abuses of the Frankish rulers. Gregory of Tours (538–594) was bishop of his city and counselor to four Merovingian kings. His History of the Franks corroborates other accounts of the efforts of Christian clergy to make peace and end the elite’s constant feuding. Gregory was responsible for the peace treaty between Childebert II and Guthram I (587).

Martin of Braga was appointed archbishop of Braga before 572. His sermon, On the Correction of Countryfolk, spells out the process of their conversion via peaceful persuasion. Sulpice, who died bishop of Bourges c.647, combined a policy of protection of the people with prophetic resistance to Merovingian tyranny. Boniface of Crediton (b.c.675) became a monk and taught and preached in Wessex until 718 when he went to today’s Germany to spread Christianity. Named bishop of Mainz, he resigned his see in 754 to resume a missionary life in Friesland and there was attacked by a band of pagans. As his followers prepared to defend themselves, he rebuked them saying, “Sons, cease fighting. Lay down your arms, for we are told in Scripture not to render evil for good, but to overcome evil by good” (Musto, 2002, p. 60). He and his followers were martyred. 13
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Boniface’s biography marks a new period when the prophet and martyr were again linked to the bishop’s administrative role. But by the end of the 8th century Europe had entered the new age of Charlemagne’s empire. The life and works of the Carolingian bishops reflects a renewed tension between prophetic protest and rulership.\(^{14}\)

Hincmar, archbishop of Reims (c.860), devoted his *On Restraining the Rapine of Soldiers* to condemning the military, as did Rather of Liège (c. 975).\(^{15}\) Atta of Vercelli and Agobard of Lyon offer similar testimony to the unity between inner peace and the external actions of peacemakers. Bishop Burchard of Worms used the medieval penitential literature as the basis for his critique of just-war practice and theory in his *Decretum* (c.1008–1012), as did Bishop Fulbert of Chartres (d.1029) in his *On Mortal Sins*.\(^ {16}\)

Boniface of Querfurt (c.974–1009) was outraged by Carolingian wars against fellow Christians and sought an alternative to violence. He went as a missionary first to the Magyars and Pechenegs and then to the Prussians around Masovia. There he and eighteen of his companions were martyred. At the end of the period, Stanislaus of Cracow (1030–79) symbolized Polish nationhood in his nonviolent confrontation of political tyranny, injustice, and cruelty. A popular preacher and spiritual leader, he was named bishop of Cracow in 1072. He soon incurred the enmity of King Boleslaus the Bold, however, for his prophetic criticism of the king’s injustice and immorality. When the king refused to change his policies, Stanislaus excommunicated Boleslaus. Shortly after this Boleslaus slew Stanislaus with his own hands while the bishop was saying Mass.

**The Peace and Truce of God**

The most important outcomes of Carolingian peacemaking were the Peace and Truce of God.\(^ {17}\) The Peace involved the protection from military violence for the clergy and their possessions: the poor; women; rural workers and their tools, animals, mills, vineyards, and labor; and later for pilgrims and merchants. The Truce stipulated that no private or public wars were to be waged from Wednesday evening until Monday morning, on certain saints’ days, during Advent, Lent, and Rogations. It sometimes protected persons and property.

The Peace originated in Frankish and Carolingian assemblies where bishops met to legislate social justice. They attempted to protect the poor from exploitation, establish basic healthcare, protect the rights of prisoners, Jews, slaves, and refugees seeking asylum, and guarantee some measure of due process.

Bishops and people joined in a series of diocesan councils, the scenes of liturgically organized, mass demonstrations for peace and justice. Moved by eloquent sermons on the need for reconciliation, thousands joined chants of “Peace, Peace, Peace!” and swore on the relics of saints to do penance and work for peace, equality, and mutual love. Participants broke the bonds of medieval hierarchy by swearing pacts of peace to one another as free equals. The methods used were almost wholly nonviolent: spiritual sanctions of excommunication and interdict against knights who refused to obey the call to peace.

Yet, the bishops also enhanced hierarchical order.\(^ {18}\) From its beginnings the Truce was inspired by the aristocracy, sworn by knights as their individual duty, and enforced with the bishops’
blessings by territorial lords. At the Council of Clermont in 1095, Pope Urban II extended the Truce to all of Christendom in preparation for the First Crusade.\textsuperscript{19}

The Peace movement soon began to appear to many as a social revolution. Bishop Gerard of Cambrai epitomized this aristocratic reaction, linking the theory of the just war to an older hierarchical model: the three orders of society. Adalbero, bishop of Laon, wrote that the Peace disrupted hierarchy in its exaltation of “serfs” as brothers and sisters. Bishops who participate humiliate themselves by encouraging the serfs and by shedding their wealth and preaching equality. To counter this trend, Adalbero redefined peace as the order of the perfect city, based on rigid social divisions and maintained by military force.

Medieval bishops, such as Cardinal Bishop Peter Damian (d.1072),\textsuperscript{20} also acted as diplomats, agents of reconciliation between warring parties and countries, legislators for their dioceses, and writers on peace and justice into the early modern period.\textsuperscript{21}

**Early Modern Peacemaking**

With the sixteenth century, the new nation-states, centrally controlled and absolutist, began to infringe on the activities of both people and clergy across Christian Europe. Kings François I of France, Henry VIII of England, Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, and Emperor Charles V exemplified the new monarchies. While Humanists like Desiderius Erasmus, Juan Luis Vives, and Thomas More extolled the virtues of Christian peacemaking, the episcopate concentrated on governance and liturgy over prophetic protest.\textsuperscript{22} There were important exceptions.

The Spanish conquest of Central and South America is probably the most controversial topic in Latin American history because it focuses debate on the Spanish role in the destruction of the region’s pre-Columbian cultures and the genocide of its peoples, and because of the role of the Catholic Church in this process. The conquistadors brought the rapid extermination of the native population through war atrocities, the brutalities of slave labor, and waves of epidemics. The quasi-feudal *encomienda* aided the process of extermination by delegating to conquistadors royal rights to exact tribute and labor from indigenous peoples. The truth of the “Black Legend” of Spanish cruelty is beyond question. We will, however, examine the life and writings of the originator of this Black Legend, the Dominican friar and later bishop, Bartolomé de Las Casas, and of his colleagues and successors.\textsuperscript{23}

Las Casas witnessed Columbus’s return from his first voyage to America. After joining a military expedition against the Spanish Morisco uprising (1497), he completed his university studies and was ordained a priest. In April 1502, he arrived in Santo Domingo. He enjoyed colonial life as an *encomendero*, ignoring the spiritual care of his indigenous parishioners. In Cuba in 1514, he experienced a conversion, gave up his *encomienda*, and began speaking out against the conquistadors. Over succeeding decades, he continued to travel back to Spain to report on injustices and to press reforms. He won the support of Cardinal Adrian of Utrecht, later Pope Adrian VI, and of the Flemish reformers and Humanists in the court of Charles V. Both Erasmus and Vives had condemned the Spanish conquest in the New World. Their influence was strong in Las Casas’ main supporter, Spain’s primate, Cardinal Ximenez de Cisneros (1436–1517).

Las Casas’ urged Ximenez to form of a commission to investigate his allegations and to take
control of the colonies. The commissioners gathered enough evidence to support the reform party and to win over Emperor Charles. Las Casas also contributed the treatise *The Indians Are Free Men and Must Be Treated as Such*. It urged the elimination of forced labor, the abolition of the *encomienda*, the replacement of conquest with peaceful settlement, protections of indigenous rights, and the provision of agricultural land, animals, health care, basic education, food supplies, and legal representation to the Americans.

Las Casas’ lobbying efforts with Charles V resulted in the promulgation of the *New Laws* of 1542 for the reform of the colonial government. His *Remedies for the Existing Evils and Very Brief Account of the Destruction of the Indies* (1542 and 1543) moved the Supreme Council of the Indies to revoke the licenses of all conquistador expeditions. In 1544, Las Casas was named bishop of Chiapas in southern Mexico. Shocked on his arrival there by the failure of the colonials to obey the *New Laws*, he forbade his priests to give absolution to any *encomendero*. In 1546, at the first synod of bishops of Latin America, he won their approval of the *Declaration of the Rights of the Indians*, a major document in the struggle for liberation.

One of the most important results of the *New Laws* was Charles V’s appointment in 1544 of fourteen reform-minded bishops for Latin America, including Las Casas, to implement their provisions. The bishops were almost all Dominicans from Salamanca, followers of Ximenez, committed to nonviolent action and basic human rights.

Bishop Antonio de Valdivieso arrived in Nicaragua in 1544. He immediately exposed abuses and soon came in conflict with Governor Contreras, his own brother, who controlled one-third of Nicaragua’s land. Valdivieso’s letters to the king show his increasing struggle for justice and his concern for his own safety, while his sermons continued to infuriate the conquistadors and the colonial administration. In February 1550, one of Francisco Pizarro’s henchmen, on leave from Peru, entered the bishop’s home and assassinated him.

Cristobal de Pedriza, bishop of Honduras (1545–1583), defied the opposition of the conquistadors and ministered to the local peoples. He soon won their loyalty despite the soldiers’ death threats. He was able to collect much testimony on Spanish abuses and brought this evidence into open accusations.

Pablo de Torres became bishop of Panama in 1547. He immediately clashed with the *encomenderos* over the enforcement of the *New Laws*, excommunicating those who refused to obey. His decisions were so radical that both the colonial governor and later the Supreme Council of the Indies nullified them. After his return to Spain in 1554, the bishop was accused of treason for his actions and forbidden to return to Central America.

Juan del Valle a professor at Salamanca University when he was made bishop of Popayan in Colombia. He arrived there in 1548 and began exposing atrocities. In church synods of 1555 and 1558 he defined the theological basis for the liberation and defense of the Americans.

The reformers’ campaign continued to the end of the sixteenth century, but its effects survived. In 1573, King Philip II enacted the *Ordinances on Discoveries*, the models for legislation on human rights in the Americas. They abolished the legal fiction of the *Requiemiento*, the
declaration of just war that underpinned the conquests, required the indigenous peoples’ freedom from forced labor, and abolished all licenses to enslave them. At the third episcopal council of Lima (Peru, 1582–83), Archbishop Toribio enacted far-reaching reform legislation for the education of indigenous peoples in their own languages and for their protection from exploitation. The decrees of the council were approved by Pope Sixtus V in 1588.

Vasco de Quiroga, a judge of the second Audiencia in Mexico, was made bishop of Michoacan. Quiroga had been influenced both by the evangelical ideal of the primitive Church and by the Humanists. The bishop read Thomas More’s *Utopia* and set out to found Utopian communities that included collective farms, hospitals, asylums, public granaries, and warehouses.

As a missionary in Mexico, Domingo de Salazar was a strong defender of the Americans. In 1573, he was ordered to Manila to free enslaved Filipinos. Once there, he set the Spanish missions on a new footing by forbidding soldiers to accompany the expeditions. In 1579, King Philip II named Salazar bishop of Manila. In 1591, Pope Gregory XIV ordered the emancipation of all Filipino slaves and the restitution of all their goods and lands.

**Modern Europe**

The early modern period in Europe has been called the “age of absolutism.” From the 16th to the late 18th century the developing nation-states of Europe developed both mechanisms and theories of rule that suppressed all opposition, clerical or lay, controlling most aspects of public life, including religion. Catholic and Protestant hierarchies became part of these state mechanisms. Within the Catholic monarchies theory and practice combined to shift the balance in bishops’ activities away from prophetic protest. In the wake of the Council of Trent (1545–63), episcopal energies were concentrated on the reformation of liturgical and sacramental practice, basic religious education, theological codification, and the standardization of popular devotion. This internalization of religious practice reinforced the state control over private and public forms and theories of peacemaking, which now focused on internal tranquility and charitable action.

A good example, which brings us into the 20th century, is the state of Catholic life in Germany. Since the Reformation, German Catholic had been on the defensive, closely associated with a foreign papacy. Mostly rural and poor, Catholics were regarded as a problem class until the 19th century, when they became increasingly socially and politically active with their own press and lay organizations. The *Kulturkampf* brought about the first test of Catholic power. This was the struggle between Chancellor Bismarck and the Catholic Church over the autonomy of Catholic schools and the Catholic defense against anticlerical politicians. Both sides eventually backed off, but the conflict put German Catholics in an unpatriotic light, pressuring them to prove their Germaness even after they had won some political power.

To this was soon added the fear of Bolshevism in Russia and its attacks on religion. In 1933 came the Reich Concordat between the Vatican and the Nazis. To these factors one must add the nature of the Catholic Church as it was understood by the bishops, clergy, and laypeople who participated in Germany’s peace movement. The Church existed not as a sect but as a corporate body that accommodated broader society within its universal mission. Its institutional survival was one of the chief missions of its hierarchy and members. When the time came, the Church in Germany was all too willing to “render to Caesar what is Caesar’s.”
Nevertheless, Catholic criticism of Nazi policy began as early as 1923 and was condemned as undue church interference with politics. In the March 1933 elections that gave the Nazis power, the Catholic vote was largely with the Catholic Center Party. The Church spoke out against the SS, Storm Troopers, and Brown Shirts; and the Austrian bishops condemned Nazism in a pastoral letter of January 15, 1934. By then, official church resistance to the Nazis was underway. The Fulda Bishops’ Conference expressed it in pastoral letters read from pulpits across the country. In its first attack the Bishops’ Conference warned Catholics that obedience to the state was not absolute and was tempered by duty to obey God before human beings.

With the coming of war, however, several elements of the “patriotism-and-protest” dynamic began to work against the Church. First, the bishops were caught up in the new nationalistic mood. Their emphasis on patriotism and pride in the nation, if not in the Nazi regime, gave most German Catholics the implicit message that to fight in Hitler’s wars was just and right. In addition, most of the church hierarchy, even those like Archbishop von Galen, who risked his life to protest Nazi euthanasia programs, and Cardinal Faulhaber, who had been outspoken against Nazi attempts to discredit the validity of the Old Testament, became avid supporters of the Fatherland, Homeland, German Folk, and Reich.

From the pulpits, in pastoral letters, and in whatever Catholic press still functioned under Nazi censorship, the message was pressed home to the Catholic laity that “good Catholics will never be on the side of the revolutionaries, no matter how bad things may get” (Musto, 2002, p. 180). Good Catholics were Good Germans, the Catholic soldier was the “soldier of Christ,” called on to defend the Homeland and to continue the fight against godless Bolshevism. Catholics who might still wonder about the morality of fighting in Hitler’s wars were further assured by the just-war tradition that gave the strongest “presumption of justice” to the government’s claims to decide the justness of its wars, and the individual Catholic’s incompetence to judge such matters. After the war, it became evident that the bishops had concluded that they could not count on the loyalty of German Catholics in an all-out church–state confrontation. Catholic tradition since Trent and the radical split between orthodox piety and secular political life had caused most Catholics to consider their religious life distinct from their secular life of business and politics. Modern orthodoxy had taught them that religion was confined to one small corner of their total life, an escape and refuge from the “real world,” which demanded most of their attention and loyalties. It would have been the rare German — as the rare French person, Italian, or American in World War II — who would have defined Catholicism as anything else but loyalty to nation and government and the surrender of individual conscience to the collective wisdom of all citizens, church, and political leaders.

But the German bishops were not alone in protest. The Dutch bishops had warned of the growing danger of Nazism as early as January 1934. In 1936, Catholics in Holland were forbidden to support the Nazis under pain of excommunication. Even during the Nazi occupation of Holland, the bishops issued a strongly worded pastoral condemning Nazism and the occupation, ordering Catholic journals not to submit to Nazi censorship. Catholic radio stations and trade unions were disbanded when the bishops refused to cooperate with Nazi demands, and the Catholic University at Nijmegen was closed after the hierarchy ordered students not to swear the oath of allegiance to Hitler. In May 1943, the Dutch bishops issued a pastoral condemning the deportation and
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persecution of the Jews, and the Nazis turned on the Dutch Catholics themselves.

In Belgium, Catholics were forbidden to support the candidacy of the Rexist allies of the Nazis; and in 1941, Cardinal van Roey condemned the Rexist Party. By 1943, Rexist were forbidden to enter Catholic churches in uniform and their leader excluded from the Sacrament. In April 1944, Cardinal van Roey condemned Nazi racial policies against the Jews and others. In Limburg Bishop Antonius Hilfrich encouraged political dissent against the Nazis and made his diocese a center of resistance.

In France, under the Vichy and German regimes, bishops were also outspoken. Cardinal Gerlier, the archbishop of Lyons and primate of France, at first welcomed the Vichy government. After his return from Rome in January 1941, however, he became closely associated with the resistance. His protest to Marshall Petain’s deportation of the Jews was read from every pulpit and broadcast throughout France. He declared a split between the French state and church and refused to bless volunteers in the Vichy army or to celebrate masses for those killed in war. Archbishop Saliège of Toulouse joined this protest, as did Bishop Pierre-Marie Théas of Lourdes. Théas was arrested and imprisoned by the Nazis as a result. After the war as a sign of forgiveness he founded Pax Christi to reconcile old enemies from across Europe.

The Postwar World

World War II reminded the Church that true peace can only be made and preserved by individuals acting as Christians who “question, criticize, and distrust” authority.26 Pope Pius XII’s postwar Christmas broadcasts clearly show a shift from a nineteenth-century trust in the capabilities of governments and of international law to check war. A new spirit emerged in the pope’s words acknowledging the role of the Catholic laity in making peace. This spirit survived into the Cold War. In his radio address (Nov. 10, 1956) on the plight of Hungary following the Soviet invasion, the pope made a forthright appeal to the people to resist tyranny and to reunite the nations of East and West. This new attitude would become a hallmark of Pius’ successor, John XXIII, and of his major achievement, the Second Vatican Council (October 11, 1962–December 8, 1965).27 His successors, Paul VI, John Paul I, and John Paul II, furthered this new approach in their writing, especially in encyclicals, and in their appointment of an entire new generation of bishops raised in the spirit of Vatican II.

We can give only a few examples of this new spirit of peacemaking from around the globe. In Poland, the efforts of Pope John Paul II to counter the tyranny of the communist state manifested itself in his support of prophetic protest from the Catholic hierarchy and of Solidarity and other mass protest movements. In a sermon at the shrine of the Black Madonna in September 1982, Bishop Bishop Ignacy Tokarczuk preached open defiance of the Polish government’s recent imposition of martial law, recalling that the Church has a duty to speak the truth and to defend the oppressed. He called on the army and the secret police to reject “blind and brutal force” (Musto, 2002, p. 207) and to disobey orders. In Northern Ireland, the Catholic hierarchy continued to work alongside such groups as the Peace People to bring about peace agreements and reconciliation.28

In South Africa,29 the Catholic Church has always been a minority church. Its early immigrant base left politics to the Protestant majority, especially the Dutch Reformed Church, which played
a large role in developing South Africa’s apartheid system. By the end of World War II, however, the Catholic Church found itself committed to the religious life of its black majority but outside the structures of white power. It was one of the first churches in South Africa to denounce the country’s system of apartheid (1948). In 1952 and again in 1957 the pastoral of Catholic bishops repeated the Church’s denunciation of oppressive racial policies. In 1960, the bishops reiterated this opposition by calling on Catholics to obey God’s law over human law.

Little by little the lead of the bishops met positive responses among the white elite and began a process of solidarity with the black majority. When the Bantu Education Act (1953) created a segregated system of schools throughout South Africa, the Catholic schools struggled to remain integrated, even after localized and discreet noncooperation with the law brought cuts in federal funds.

In the 1970s — given the influence of Vatican II, of Paul VI’s Populorum Progressio, and of the developing theology of liberation — South African Catholics moved to a new level of struggle. In 1972, the Catholic Bishops Conference unanimously adopted its Call to Conscience, which condemned detention without trial, banning, and the exploitation of black labor. In 1976, the bishops announced their intention of breaking South African law by openly integrating two Catholic schools. In 1977, the Church publicly integrated thirty schools in the Transvaal, and Pretoria’s opposition crumbled. Not only did 85 percent of the Catholics surveyed approve of the move, but the bishops’ determination enabled the Pretoria government to make changes that many South Africans favored privately but feared to support as public policy. A basic tenet of nonviolence became manifest: through peaceful commitment to justice the peacemaker frees both the oppressed and the oppressors from their own injustices.

The Philippines offers the best example of Catholic episcopal peacemaking in Asia. By 1979 the Church had finally found a voice and a unified position in Jaime Cardinal Sin, archbishop of Manila and president of the Bishops’ Conference. The archbishop was typical of a new breed of church prelates. At first, Sin opted for a policy of “critical collaboration,” attempting to remain personally friendly with dictator Ferdinand Marcos while rebuking him for isolated human-rights abuses. He refused to support any mass protests against the regime. He soon began calling for an end to martial law, however, condemning the abuses of the military government. He reminded the people that subversive violence only brings retaliation on the suffering poor it is intended to liberate. At the same time the Bishops’ Conference issued a pastoral condemning violence on the right and left and calling for nonviolent change which eventually led to a democratic regime.

Latin America

Latin America has long been the laboratory of Catholic practice and theory, including active peacemaking. From Latin America have come several of the most important strains of modern Catholicism, including Basic Christian Communities, Liberation Theology, and new forms of nonviolent prophetic protest and theory. The major theological event for Latin America’s struggle for liberation was the conference held in Medellín (Colombia) from August 24 to September 6, 1968. Medellín was the second general meeting of CELAM, the Conference of Latin American Bishops. It brought together a growing unity among Latin America’s Catholics, the impact of liberation theology, the influence of Vatican II, and Paul VI’s Populorum Progressio. The Medellín documents deal with two essential topics: Justice and Peace. Part I of the peace
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In Brazil the pressures and dislocations of development caused political unrest in the early 1960s and threatened the ruling oligarchy. In 1964, General Castelo Branco staged a coup and brought the country under a harsh military dictatorship. In keeping with the Catholic Church’s traditional alliance with the state and the ruling elite, at first many of its members supported the military regime. Yet gradually the Catholic Church began to embrace the cause of the poor and the oppressed and to work for their liberation and for the nonviolent overthrow of the generals. The most significant figure in this process was the archbishop of Recife, “the voice of the Third World” and Nobel Peace Prize nominee, Dom Helder Camara.33

During the late 1950s and early 1960s Dom Helder was closely involved with Brazil’s elite and their development schemes. By 1960, however, he had begun to pay close attention to the reform ideas of Pope John XXIII and to have serious doubts about the wisdom of capitalist interventions. In 1960, he negotiated with the government on behalf of the bishops to establish the Movement for Basic Education (MEB), which reached out to the oppressed and uneducated to enable them to analyze and criticize, to realize their human potential and dignity, and to act to remove the burdens of their own oppression.

By 1963, Dom Helder had come to repudiate the US Alliance for Progress with its emphasis on top-down development. Shortly after he criticized the program to the US ambassador, he lost favor with the ruling elite. Newspapers began to vilify him, and in April 1964, immediately after the coup, he was transferred from Rio to the oblivion of Recife in northeast Brazil. His transfer only brought him closer to Brazil’s poverty, ignorance, disease, and social oppression. He called on the military government to make necessary reforms and became such a problem for the generals that in 1967 the neofascist Tradition, Family, Property (TFP) movement demanded his purge from the Church.

Despite the TFP denunciations of all reform attempts as communist subversion, Camara vigorously pursued the new direction, condemning extremes of both capitalism and communism and denouncing the US and USSR for their selfishness in the face of world poverty. He condemned Brazil’s economic and social system in clear terms, labelling the superpowers’ policies the “M-bomb,” the bomb of human misery, worse than the A-bomb (Musto, 2002, p. 226).

In October 1968, Camara united 43 of Brazil’s 253 bishops and thousands of Catholic laypeople to launch his Action, Justice, and Peace movement, an attempt at “revolution through peace” (Musto, 2002, p. 227). He used tools available to any bishop as the coordinator of diocesan liturgy, including the witness of religious processions, of human chains to prevent violence between police and protestors, and decisions to embrace voluntary poverty. By 1973, one-third of the country’s 270 bishops had embraced a program that did not hesitate to condemn the government. Sao Paulo’s archbishop, Cardinal Paulo Evaristo Ams, began a campaign for human rights in 1970, and the bishops of northeastern Brazil kept up their prophetic denunciations of the military government, its economic policies, and its torture and assassinations. Their pastoral *I Have Heard the Cries of My People* (1973) condemned church
complicity with the power elite.

At Bogota (Colombia) in December 1977, the International Meeting of Latin American Bishops issued a document that has been called Latin America’s Charter of Nonviolence. The document reaffirmed the commitment of the Catholic Church to witness with its blood for “justice, for peace, and for the defense of the weak and oppressed” (Musto, 2002, p. 231). It also presented a theology of peacemaking for Latin America. The Christian, it declared, must not abide evil but must defend Christian values through peaceful means. “Violence,” it reminded Latin Americans, “is un-Christian and unevangelical, not to mention inefficacious” (Musto, 2002, p. 231). The document condemned the violence of the national security state, of economic exploitation, and of terrorism and subversion.

The third meeting of CELAM was held in Puebla (Mexico) in 1979. Its Final Document reconfirmed the positions of Medellin and deepened the Church’s commitment to the poor and the oppressed. The conference also rejected both the violence of the national security state, and terrorist and guerrilla violence. Its Final Document quickly became part of official Catholic teaching around the world and was endorsed by Pope John Paul II.34

Oscar Romero
Romero was ordained a bishop in 1970.35 He trusted in the Constantinian alliance of church and state, preferring to apply subtle “leverage” with the ruling authorities, believing that the government needed only adjustments and reforms, and that the Church was most effective for its flock in alliance with power. In 1977, Romero became archbishop of El Salvador. By the time of his first formal meeting with his clergy, Romero had turned against El Salvador’s brutal elite. He kept up his criticisms of the government through a series of nationally broadcast pastoral addresses. He fully adopted the theology of liberation, preaching the mission to save the oppressed, to bear the cross of persecution for one’s witness, and urging forgiveness of enemies and persecutors.

The government responded to the Church’s campaign for nonviolent change with massacres, desecration of churches, and continued attacks on individuals both lay and clerical. By the end of 1977, Romero had boycotted the inauguration of General Romero, had publicly called for disobedience to the Law of Public Order (the martial-law statute), and had condemned the country’s Supreme Court and judiciary for corruption and cowardice. In November 1978, he was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. Finally on March 23, 1980, the archbishop shocked the nation with an impassioned plea for the end of violence. He climaxed his sermon by calling on the enlisted men of El Salvador’s army to lay down their arms. The next day, the archbishop was assassinated. His final words summarized the commitment of Latin America’s bishops to peacemaking.

You may say, if they succeed in killing me, that I pardon and bless those who do it. Would that thus they might be convinced that they will waste their time. A bishop will die, but the Church of God, which is the people, will never perish (Musto, 2002, p. 237).

USA
Throughout the Colonial and early National periods, the Catholic Church in the United States
was a minority institution, tolerated yet marginalized by the majority Protestant culture and the British Establishment and linked to the enemies of Britain: France and Spain. During the the 19th century, it became associated with new and suspect Germans, Irish, and Italian immigrants and with the Hispanic people of the Southwest. Catholic life therefore remained internalized and isolated. With the 20th century and World War I, however, American Catholics began to emerge from marginalization. The immigrant church went out of its way to assert its Americanness and ultra-loyalty in much the same way as German Catholics after the Kulturkampf. Few Catholics protested World War I. Of the 3,989 conscientious objectors to the conflict, only four were Catholic. At the end of the war, American bishops wrote a pastoral letter, Lessons of War, urging the United States to accept its unique role to “restore peace and order” according to “the principles of reasonable liberty and of Christian civilization” (Musto, 2002, p. 240), thus condoning the war as a crusade. Through the 1920s and 1930s Catholic peace groups made tentative beginnings, and many Catholics sided with isolationist voices, but US bishops firmly supported government policy on war and peace.

With the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, most Catholics became fervent supporters of the war. In their pastoral letter, The Crisis of Christianity, the bishops had already condemned the dangers of Nazism and communism. Telling Catholics that “we support wholeheartedly the adequate defense of our country” (Musto, 2002, p. 244), the bishops called on Catholics to “render to Caesar.” They declared that all authority comes from God, and that therefore, even in democratic countries, citizens must obey their rulers. The following year the bishops declared the war effort just, telling Catholics that although war is a last resort, at times it is a positive duty.

At the end of the World War II, the American Catholic Church entered into a wholehearted alliance with the US government against international communism. In their 1944 pastoral, International Order, the US bishops echoed papal teaching and called for a new international order based on moral law, the recognition of God, the oneness of humanity, and international community. At the same time, the bishops began to show a distrust of US interests and actions. In November 1945, they warned the government against the temptation to make agreements with the Soviets based on simple power considerations, calling the poverty and helplessness of the world’s people the greatest obstacle to true peace. The next year the bishops condemned the postwar order as no true peace but one that imposed settlements on the war-torn and ignored the true calling of peacemakers: care for the imprisoned, the displaced, and all the victims of the conflict. The Church continued to proclaim this message throughout the 1950s, insisting on the importance of the individual and of personal conscience.

This tone dominated the bishops’ last pastoral of the 1950s, Freedom and Peace. While the letter is clearly a Cold War document and warned of the dangers of atheistic communism, it links this threat to an excessive nationalism that blinds Americans to the basic unity of all peoples and the abject “poverty, hunger, disease and bitterness engendered by social injustice” (Musto, 2002, p. 247) that communist aggression exploits. Before it can accept the challenge of injustice in the Third World, they said, America must undergo a conversion of its own.

By 1960, Catholic bishops had begun to prod the government in significant ways and to question many of the fundamental assumptions of American life and power. Their pastoral,
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*Personal Responsibility* (November 1960) noted that too much responsibility for peace had been entrusted to international bodies and not enough to individuals. The American church reflected changes in papal thought that John XXIII had introduced and thus prepared the way for the next wave of Catholic peacemaking. This was to center on the peace movement that grew out of several sources: the protest movements against nuclear war led by Catholic laypeople such as Dorothy Day, groups such as the Catholic Peace Fellowship (CPF), and the quickly emerging peace movement against the war in Vietnam.39

**Vietnam**

Despite the CPF’s public call for the bishops to condemn the Vietnam War, in November 1966 the bishops issued their pastoral *Peace and Vietnam*, in which they used Vatican II to support the conclusion that “it is reasonable to argue that our presence in Vietnam is justified.”40 Yet few were willing to go to the same extremes as Francis Cardinal Spellman’s blessing of artillery used by the US Army, calling for a military victory, and exiling vocal opponents of the war like Fr. Daniel Berrigan, SJ. In June 1966, Lawrence Cardinal Sheahan of Baltimore issued a pastoral letter instructing Catholics that Vatican II had legitimized both just defense and conscientious objection. Conscience was the key to deciding the legitimacy of the war and to limiting its violence. Sheahan’s position was reflected in the bishops’ next pastoral, the *Resolution on Peace* (Nov. 16, 1967), which criticized the extremism of both left and right but acknowledged that the antiwar protestors represented “responsible segments of our society” (Musto, 2002, p. 255). They did not repeat their 1966 endorsement of the war as just.

Throughout 1967 and 1968 events in Vietnam and the pressures of the Catholic left brought changes in the thinking of the hierarchy. Despite tremendous pressures brought on him to suppress Dorothy Day’s Catholic Worker organization, Cardinal Spellman refused. Most of the Catholic bishops had moved toward neutrality on the war, and the number of dissenting bishops steadily grew. In November 1968, the bishops issued a pastoral, *Human Life in Our Day*, the American reply to Paul VI’s *Humanae Vitae*.41

Invoking Vatican II’s call to “evaluate war with an entirely new attitude,” the bishops condemned aggressive wars and total war. They reminded Catholics that “in the Christian message peace is not merely the absence of war or the balance of power.” Charity and justice are true peace, and they are achieved not by support of dictatorships but by true development as defined by Paul VI. The bishops repeated the message of *Gaudium et Spes*, condemning the “indiscriminate destruction of whole cities or vast areas with their inhabitants [as] a crime against God and man.” They endorsed the Partial Test-Ban Treaty and the Non-Proliferation Treaty, condemned the antiballistic missile (ABM), the doctrine of nuclear superiority and escalation, and described the arms race as “an utterly treacherous trap for humanity,… which ensnares the poor to an intolerable degree” (Musto, 2002, p. 255).

The bishops declared their opposition to the peacetime draft as an institution that only contributes to future wars. They posed several questions about the war in Vietnam: Has the United States already crossed the point of proportionality that makes the war unjust? Can the United States now withdraw? Would the billions of dollars being spent on war be better used on hospitals, schools, poverty programs, and positive works of social justice?
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They declared that conscientious objectors — even selective conscientious objectors, who refuse to fight because of the injustice of a particular war — have a basis in modern Catholic teaching, and that unquestioning obedience “is not necessarily in conformity with the mind and heart of the Church.” The prelates therefore declared that the Selective Service System must modify the draft law to include selective objection against particular wars considered unjust or immoral, and that Catholics must follow their consciences in refusing to serve. They concluded that “the hour has indeed struck for ‘conversion,’ for personal transformation, for interior renewal” (Musto, 2002, p. 256).

By August 1970, the bishops had become critical of US policy toward the UN and the developing world and praised American overtures to the communist government of the Peoples’ Republic of China. In October 1971, they repeated Vatican II’s call on Catholics to follow the dictates of conscience. The bishops again pressed the Selective Service System to authorize selective objection and to grant amnesty to draft resisters. The letter was approved by over two-thirds of the American prelates. Finally in November 1971, the bishops condemned the war in Vietnam as unjust, its destructiveness far disproportionate to the good that was sought there. They called for its rapid conclusion, the rebuilding of Southeast Asia, pardons and amnesties for war resisters, the rehabilitation of veterans and prisoners of war, and forgiveness and reconciliation for all Americans.42

The Bishops, The Bomb, and Peace
By the late 20th century, the conversion of the American Catholic Church into a force for peace and justice was nowhere more clearly seen than in the direction taken by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. By the late 1970s, the bishops had taken two steps that reflected these changes: they opened their conferences to the participation of all clergy and laity on every level of the Church; and they moved decisively toward breaking with the US government on the issues of nuclear arms, deterrence, and war and peace.

In October 1976, the Detroit Call to Action Conference called for the condemnation both of the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons, and of their production and possession. In 1978 and 1979, the bishops supported the SALT II Treaty on disarmament between the US and USSR. In 1980, in the face of national reaction to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and a political campaign that sought to use the draft as a test of loyalty and anticomunism, they again affirmed the Catholic right of conscientious objection and selective conscientious objection. While they approved the general idea of draft registration, they also declared that the state must show convincing reasons for its particular action. Despite the approval, the bishops affirmed their opposition to the draft at that time, condemned a draft of women, and recommended that draft counseling be available in Catholic schools and agencies.

The election of Ronald Reagan to the presidency, the deterioration of US-Soviet relations, the return to the Cold War of the 1950s, and the crisis in Central America underlay a shift in US Catholic attitudes to the state and to peace. In November 1982, the US Catholic Conference issued its Statement on Central America. The bishops affirmed Vatican II, Medellín, Puebla, and the tradition of liberation and peace. They mourned the martyrdoms of Archbishop Oscar Romero and the four American churchwomen in El Salvador and confirmed the “special tie to our brother bishops and to the Church in Central America” (Musto, 2002, p. 261). The bishops
flatly refuted US government policy and called for an end to US military intervention in Central America, for a political solution to the region’s problems, for asylum for political refugees, and for an end to the deportations of Central American refugees. They voiced concern over curtailment of human rights in Nicaragua under the Sandinistas, but they also opposed the Reagan administration’s policy there, and they decried the abuses of human rights in neighboring Guatemala.

By the 1980s, individual Catholic bishops had come to the forefront of Catholic witness and prophecy against war. Seattle’s Bishop Raymond Hunthausen’s adoption of tax resistance in June 1981 sent shock waves across the country.44 That July, Bishop Kenny of Juneau, Alaska, declared that “I will not fight for my country. More and more I find myself in opposition to all military power. I am becoming what in common parlance is called a pacifist” (Musto, 2002, p. 262). In August 1981, Amarillo’s Bishop L.T. Matthiesen called on the United States to stop production of the neutron bomb and announced the establishment of a fund to ease the transition for workers who leave defense work in favor of peaceful production.45 Thomas Gumbleton, while still auxiliary bishop of Detroit, took a major role in persuading his fellow US bishops to condemn the Vietnam War. He later worked along laypeople at Pax Christi, in the Nevada Test Site witness, and in numerous other peacemaking roles.46

In their 1983 pastoral, The Challenge of Peace: God’s Promise and Our Response, the American bishops formalized these trends reflecting both Vatican II and Gaudium et Spes.47 Both pacifism and “active nonviolence” were seen as evangelical imitations of Christ and legitimate means of serving the political community, as means of Christian action as legitimate as military defense in the service of the nation. The bishops declared that nonviolence “best reflects the call of Jesus both to love and to justice” (Musto, 2002, p. 262)

The bishops defined the Church above all as the “People of God” marked by their gospel imitation of Christ. Christian witness must be assertive, it must not fear accusations of political interference when it speaks out on vital issues. Reflecting the developing theory of the “seamless garment,” the bishops declared that Christians must revere life in all its forms and cannot accept violence in any form, whether from the oppression of poverty, abuse of human and civil rights, pornography, or abortion. They then called for conversion among Catholics to examine their consciences and to help build a new theology of peace, to choose professions carefully, to serve humanity, and to act on their consciences to change their lives toward the positive works of peace. The US bishops’ 1988 Building Peace: A Pastoral Reflection on the Response to The Challenge of Peace furthered their thinking on becoming a peacemaking church.49

As the decades passed, succeeding popes made their stamp on the Church through their pastoral teaching in encyclicals, administrative actions, and their selection of new bishops.50 Popes John Paul II, Benedict XVI, and Francis I deepened the Church’s commitment to social justice and the preference for the poor in many ways; and in others modified support for the move toward the prophetic peace church. On November 7, 1990, the US Conference of Catholic Bishops “Letter to Secretary of State James Baker” took a cautious approach to the impending invasion of Iraq, balancing just-war and gospel precepts.51 This return to pre-Vietnam approaches to war and peace was enshrined in the USCCB’s 2023 reposting of the Catechism of the Catholic Church of 1997 under chapter 3: “Safeguarding Peace.” Here again peace becomes Augustine’s “tranquility of
order.” The *Catechism* reasserts the right of nations to use violence in self-defense, and the prior right of civil authorities in deciding on the justness of war. Yet it also repeated its numerous assertions of the right to conscientious objection. Recent Catholic thought also focuses on the teaching and practice of “just peace,” enshrining a long tradition of Catholic peacemaking and thought that is ever-growing, changing emphasis with the times, and nurtured into reality through the Catholic episcopate.  
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